REMARKS

Claims 29-48 stand rejected in the office action dated March 27, 2009 in view of Excel (Microsoft® Excel 2000, Copyright (c) 1985-1999 Microsoft Corp.), ("Excel").

Claim Objection

Claim 38 is objected to for allegedly omitting the word "at" in the element that recites "and may be placed on the canvas at least one of:". However, Applicants submit that the claim reads properly as is, and request further clarification of the Examiner's objection. In particular, replacing the "at least one of" language with either option set forth in the subsequent "or" statement would result in either:

"and may be placed on the canvas before the virtual gridline is defined"

or

"and may be placed on the canvas after the virtual gridline is defined."

Including another "at," as suggested in the office action, would result in the claim reading "and may be placed on the canvas at before the virtual gridline is defined" or "may be placed on the canvas at after the virtual gridline is defined." Thus, Applicants submit that the language "and may be placed on the canvas at least one of: before the virtual gridline is defined, or after the virtual gridline is defined" appears to be proper.

Thus, Applicants are unclear as to where an additional "at" would be placed in the claim. Clarification is requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 29-48

Claims 29-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of by Excel (Microsoft® Excel 2000, Copyright (c) 1985-1999 Microsoft Corp.), ("Excel").

Independent claims 29 and 38 recites a method for creating a grid canvas comprising defining a virtual gridline, identifying a user-interface element on the grid canvas, and identifying a relationship of the virtual gridline to the user-interface element. In particular, Applicants point out the previously made amendment to independent claims 29 and 38 such

that the independent claims recite *a property set for the gridline that defines a relationship of the gridline to the user-interface element on the canvas.*

The Section 103 rejection of claims 29-48 in the present office action (dated 3/17/09) is made in view of Excel, repeating the same reasons for rejection set forth in the previous office action dated 12/5/08. The office action addresses Applicants arguments made in the previously filed response in the Response to Arguments section of the present office action (office action, page 7-8), asserting that the Applicant's arguments filed on 2/27/09 in response to the 12/5/08 office action were not persuasive.

However, at the outset, Applicants would like to point out that the Response to Arguments section does not completely address Applicant's arguments or amendments made in the 2/27/09 response. In particular, the office action asserts that Excel teaches a property of a gridline that identifies a relationship of the gridline to a user interface element because changing the position of the gridline has a corresponding effect on the user interface element. However, Applicants submit that the office action does not address the explicit recitation that "a property *set* for the gridline defines a relationship of the gridline to the user-interface element on the canvas." Rather, the office action refers to a property set in Excel *for an image* that is effected by the movement of a gridline. Applicants submit that setting properties from the perspective of the gridline is not the same as setting a properly from the perspective of an image, or user interface element (as claimed).

The office action refers to Excel figures that were provided with the 12/5/08 office action, so references to these figures by Applicants herein are to the same set of figures. The office action asserts that Excel shows a property of a gridline (width 103 pixels). However, this width, shown in FIG. 8, is not a property *set for a gridline* that defines a relationship of *the virtual gridline to a user-interface element* on the canvas. In fact, the width (Width of 103 pixel) shown in FIG. 8 of Excel, referenced by the office action as a property of the gridline, is actually a property of the image, not the gridline. As further evidence of this, FIG. 7 of Excel clearly indicates that the properties are set for the picture or image, not the gridline. The selection of the image property, shown in FIG. 7, is to "move and size with cells," which moves the image with the cells. This is a property selected for the image, this does not teach a property set from the perspective of the gridline. Applicants submit that regardless if the property set for the image causes the image to respond to changes to the cells

in Excel, nowhere does Excel or the portions of Excel cited in the office action teach a property set for the gridline. Applicants, on the other hand, have recognized the benefits of setting properties from perspectives of an element and/or a gridline, providing a more comprehensive approach to resizing. This is simply not taught by Excel.

In fact, if one follows the steps shown in the Excel figures referred to in the office action (Figs. 7-10), by selecting the property of the image to "move and size with cells," movement of a gridline or resizing cells on the grid thereafter does indeed relocate or resize the image. However, movement of or resizing the image thereafter *does not* move the gridline (i.e., the relationship is *not* bi-directional). Again, any properties changed in Excel and referenced by the office action are all from the perspective of the image.

Thus, Applicants submit that Excel does not teach or suggest a property set from the perspective of the gridline, much less a property set for the gridline that defines a relationship of the virtual gridline to a user-interface element on the canvas.

Because both independent claims 29 and 38 recite elements that are not taught or suggested by Excel, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29 and 38 patentably define over Excel. As claims 30-38 and 39-48 depend from claims 29 and 38, respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also not anticipated by Excel for the reasons explained above, and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 29-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 38-48

Furthermore, with respect to claim 38, Applicants also submit that Excel does not teach:

> "maintaining the relationship of the virtual gridline to the user-interface element on the canvas, wherein the relationship is bidirectional, and resizing the user-interface element will move the gridline, and moving the gridline will resize the user-interface element."

At the outset, Applicants would like to point out that the office action does not address, in either the body of the office action or in the Response to Arguments section, Applicant's arguments or amendments with respect to this claim element made in the 2/27/09 response.

In particular, the relationship in Excel between the element and the gridline, shown in Figs. 6-8, is not bi-directional as claimed. In the instance of Excel's image depicted in Figs. 6-8, Excel does not function to result in both a resizing of the image upon movement of a gridline *and* the movement of a gridline upon resizing of the image, as claimed. The Office Action only addresses the second aspect "moving the gridline will resize the user-interface element." The claims recites both aspects of the bi-directional relationship, *i.e.*, resizing of the image upon movement of a gridline *and* the movement of a gridline upon resizing of the image. Nowhere is Excel shown to teach both aspects of the relationship, and thus, Excel does not teach a bi-directional relationship between the gridline and the user-interface element.

Because both Excel does not teach all of the elements of claim 38, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably defines over Excel. As claims 39-48 depend from claim 38, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also not anticipated by Excel for the reasons explained above, and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 38-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Lori Anne D. Swanson (215.564.8997) to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: 2009-06-17

/Lori Anne D. Swanson/

Lori Anne D. Swanson
Registration No. 59048

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439